Interview Summary	**Application No.** 10/676,024	**Applicant(s)** KURODA ET AL.
	Examiner Larisa Z. Tsukerman	**Art Unit** 2833

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) _Larisa Z. Tsukerman_.

(3) Paula Bradley - SPE

(2) _Schiavelli, Alan_.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: _01 December 2005_.

Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference
  c)☒ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes e)☒ No.
  If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _1-4,_.

Identification of prior art discussed: _Prior art & Oda_

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached. g)☒ was not reached. h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _see. below_

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Discussed differences between invention and art cited particularly peep hole and location in relations to terminal lance and housing lug. Suggested to use Pre Appeal conference.

Paula Bradley

Larisa Tsukerman

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

_____
Examiner's signature, if required